

happen that *all* the species following such generic names would not be considered by the Author who proposed the name as belonging to his group, the one *immediately* following is always a typical species ...'. In his Addenda Curtis placed the name *Oecothea* after species 17, which meant that *Oecothea* was inserted immediately in front of species 18, *fenestralis* Fallén. Hence, as *fenestralis* Fallén is the one immediately following *Oecothea*, it was a 'typical species'.

4. Woźnica & Zatwarnicki say that 'the absence of the species numbered between 18 and 23 meant that the precise position at which *Oecothea* related to the main text was not indicated'. However, as stated in his introduction, Curtis dealt with large Diptera genera by using the numbers of Meigen. There are gaps as there were many species in Meigen that were not known from Britain.

5. In conclusion, we endorse the application to establish formally what Curtis originally intended, which was to credit the name *Oecothea* to Haliday and to have *Helomyza fenestralis* Fallén, 1820 as the type species.

Comments on the proposed designation of a neotype for *Coelophysys bauri* (Cope, 1887) (Reptilia, Saurischia)

(Case 2840; see BZN 49: 276–279; 50: 147–151)

(1) Hilde L. Schwartz

Earth and Environmental Sciences, M.S. D469, Los Alamos National Laboratory, Los Alamos, New Mexico 87545, U.S.A.

I would like to express my support for the purpose of the application by Colbert et al., that is, to conserve the name *Coelophysys bauri* and to reject *Rioarribasaurus colberti* Hunt & Lucas, 1991. My own research on New Mexican Triassic rocks reveals no stratigraphic justification for the new genus *Rioarribasaurus*, and the additional considerations of priority and widespread current usage I believe make the name *Rioarribasaurus colberti* a source of taxonomic confusion rather than clarification.

(2) R.E. Molnar

Queensland Museum, P.O. Box 3300, South Brisbane, Queensland 4101, Australia

I wish to present an argument distinct from, and more philosophical than, those presented by Colbert et al. in their application, which I support. To me there seems a basic philosophic and methodologic difference between the approach of Colbert to the taxonomy of *Coelophysys* and that of Hunt & Lucas. Colbert seems to subscribe to the school of taxonomy very largely influenced by G.G. Simpson and E. Mayr in which fossils are recognized as only examples which have been 'selected' from a population of living organisms. These living organisms varied among themselves, and hence recognition of diagnostic characters of a taxon, and referral of future discoveries to the taxon, depend on the character states as exhibited by the hypodigm, of which the type specimen is the name-bearer. In organisms exhibiting marked sexual dimorphism, for example, the holotype might be a male specimen and yet females have the same operational significance as males.

Hunt & Lucas, on the other hand, seem to subscribe to a more typological school of thought, emphasizing the necessity of the use of the holotype alone in identification (Hunt & Lucas, 1991, p. 194). Since the importance of the population in evolution is well established, and no appreciation of the degree of variation in a population can be obtained from examination of any single specimen (holotype or not) alone, it is clear that use of the holotype in this fashion will lead to 'over-splitting' of fossil taxa and an unnecessary proliferation of names. This would result in a lack of congruence between actual taxa and their names. The ramifications extend beyond the taxonomy of Triassic saurischians.

Personally, I believe the appropriate action to maintain stability of nomenclature and taxonomic practice is to support the recommendations of Colbert et al. To introduce the name *Rioarribasaurus colberti* implies supporting an at least quasi-typological view of taxonomy, inconsistent with the importance of utilising populations in the study of taxonomy.

Clearly the original specimens of *Coelophysis* were deemed diagnostic around the turn of the century by competent taxonomists such as Cope, Hay and von Huene. Also clearly, they are not now deemed so by competent taxonomists such as Padian, Colbert et al. and Hunt & Lucas. However, should this not involve the acceptance of new type material rather than erecting a new name? The latter practice would lead to changing of name every time a new taxonomic feature is recognized.

I believe these factors should be carefully considered, and that such consideration will lend support to the proposals of Colbert et al. on BZN 49: 278.

(3) Zdeněk V. Špínar

Prysk 66, 471 15, Czech Republic

I strongly support the conservation of the very well established usage of the name *Coelophysis bauri*, as proposed in the application by Colbert et al.

(4) Thomas R. Holtz, Jr.

Geological Survey, United States Department of the Interior, MS 970, National Center, Reston, Virginia 22092, U.S.A.

1. As a theropod worker, I write concerning the proposed replacement of the lectotype of *Coelophysis bauri* by a neotype. Although Hunt & Lucas (1991) were correct in observing that the lectotype of *C. bauri* is indeed nondiagnostic to the specific level, I do not believe that their solution (creation of the name *Rioarribasaurus colberti* for the Ghost Ranch specimens) best serves the paleontological community.

2. Some authors may write citing the widespread use of the name *Coelophysis* for the Ghost Ranch dinosaurs in the popular literature. However, I believe that the transfer of type suggested in Case 2840 can be supported on technical grounds. Note that some of these points are reiterations of the observations and suggestions raised by Colbert et al.

3. Since the late 1940s the concept of *Coelophysis* in the technical literature has been almost entirely based on the Ghost Ranch specimens. From a spectacular site which preserves hundreds of articulated specimens of many growth stages, the Ghost